



3 1223 08514 3429

DEPARTMENT

City and County of San Francisco • 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 • San Francisco, California • 4103-2414

MAIN NUMBER DIRECTOR'S OFFICE

(415) 558-6378

PHONE: 558-6411

4TH FLOOR
FAX: 558-6426

ZONING ADMINISTRATOR

PHONE: 558-6350

5TH FLOOR
FAX: 558-6409

PLANNING INFORMATION

PHONE: 558-6377

MAJOR ENVIRONMENTAL
FAX: 558-5991

COMMISSION CALENDAR

INFO: 558-6422

INTERNET WEB SITE
SFGOV.ORG/PLANNING

MEMORANDUM: Historic Resource Evaluation Response

MEA Planner: Nannie Turrell
 Project Address: 227-29 West Point Rd.
 Block: 4720/4624 Lot: 03,04,09,027
 Case No.: 2007.0168E
 Date of Report: November 5, 2007

Planning Department Reviewer:
 Tim Frye
 415-575-6822
tim.frye@sfgov.org

5/S



San Francisco Public Library

Government Information Center
 San Francisco Public Library
 100 Larkin Street, 5th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94102

REFERENCE BOOK

Not to be taken from the Library

Owner/Contact

Name: San Francisco Housing
 Authority
 Address: 440 Turk Street
 SF, CA 94102
 Phone: (415) 715-3217

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAR - 5 2008

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

all existing (267) units and community facilities associated with the Hunters
 and construct between 650-800 units within a redeveloped and spatially-
 community.

g / Survey

y constructed in 1956, is not listed on any known surveys or registers.

hood Context

plex is comprised of 55 buildings along Middle Point, West Point Roads, Willis,
 and Kent Streets. The buildings have a rectangular footprint and range from one- to three-stories in
 height. They run parallel or address the street at an angle. Only Middle Point Road bisects the complex. All
 other adjacent thoroughfares terminate into cul-de-sacs. Along with the steeply-sloping topography, these
 conditions have created a neighborhood relatively isolated from its surroundings.

1.) California Register Criteria of Significance: Note, a building may be an historical resource if
 it meets any of the California Register criteria listed below. If more information is needed to make
 such a determination please specify what information is needed. (This determination for California Register
 Eligibility is made based on existing data and research provided to the Planning Department by the above named
 preparer / consultant and other parties. Key pages of report and a photograph of the subject building are attached.)

- **Event:** or ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unable to determine
- **Persons:** or ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unable to determine
- **Architecture:** or ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unable to determine
- Information Potential:** ☐ Further investigation recommended.
- District or Context** ☐ Yes, may contribute to a potential district or significant context

; Period of significance:

The subject complex does not exhibit any of the characteristics that would identify it as eligible for the
 nia Register. Staff concurs with the report developed by Carey & Company that the Hunters View
 g development is not significant for its association with postwar public housing development.

D
 REF
 711.4097
 H919r



PLANNING DEPARTMENT

City and County of San Francisco • 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 • San Francisco, California • 4103-2414

MAIN NUMBER
(415) 558-6378

4TH FLOOR
FAX: 558-6426

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
PHONE: 558-6411

ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
PHONE: 558-6350

5TH FLOOR
FAX: 558-6409

PLANNING INFORMATION
PHONE: 558-6377

MAJOR ENVIRONMENTAL
FAX: 558-5991

COMMISSION CALENDAR
INFO: 558-6422

INTERNET WEB SITE
SFGOV.ORG/PLANNING

MEMORANDUM: Historic Resource Evaluation Response

MEA Planner: Nannie Turrell
Project Address: 227-29 West Point Rd.
Block: 4720/4624 **Lot:** 03,04,09,027
Case No.: 2007.0168E
Date of Review: November 5, 2007

Planning Department Reviewer:
Tim Frye
415-575-6822
tim.frye@sfgov.org

Preparer / Consultant

Name:
Company: Cary & Company, Inc.
Address: 724 Pine Street
SF, CA 94108
Phone: (415) 362-5154

Owner/Contact

Name: San Francisco Housing
Authority
Address: 440 Turk Street
SF, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 715-3217

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

PROPOSED PROJECT

- ☒ Demolition
☐ Alteration

MAR - 5 2008

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Project description:

- The proposal is to demolish all existing (267) units and community facilities associated with the Hunters View housing complex and construct between 650-800 units within a redeveloped and spatially-integrated mixed-income community.

Pre-Existing Historic Rating / Survey

The subject complex, originally constructed in 1956, is not listed on any known surveys or registers.

Historic District / Neighborhood Context

The Hunters View housing complex is comprised of 55 buildings along Middle Point, West Point Roads, Willis, Hare and Keith Streets. The buildings have a rectangular footprint and range from one- to three-stories in height. They run parallel or address the street at an angle. Only Middle Point Road bisects the complex. All other adjacent thoroughfares terminate into cul-de-sacs. Along with the steeply-sloping topography, these conditions have created a neighborhood relatively isolated from its surroundings.

1.) California Register Criteria of Significance: Note, a building may be an historical resource if it meets any of the California Register criteria listed below. If more information is needed to make such a determination please specify what information is needed. (This determination for California Register Eligibility is made based on existing data and research provided to the Planning Department by the above named preparer / consultant and other parties. Key pages of report and a photograph of the subject building are attached.)

- Event:** or ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unable to determine
- Persons:** or ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unable to determine
- Architecture:** or ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unable to determine
- Information Potential:** ☐ Further investigation recommended.
- District or Context** ☐ Yes, may contribute to a potential district or significant context

If Yes; Period of significance:

Notes: The subject complex does not exhibit any of the characteristics that would identify it as eligible for the California Register. Staff concurs with the report developed by Carey & Company that the Hunters View housing development is not significant for its association with postwar public housing development.

While there are other sites that are associated with significant events in the development of public housing in San Francisco during the post World War II era, the subject site does not qualify under these events. Unlike the development of North Beach Place, Holly Court, or Ping Yuen, the subject site did not have a specific program or the long-range economic and sociological goals associated with other public housing developments to make them unique.

Based on archival documentation, the subject site is not associated with any significant persons.

The subject buildings do not possess the craftsmanship or distinction in design that would identify them as eligible for the California Register. The buildings that make up this complex are not a fine or exemplary representation of a style. Like many public housing initiatives of the time, the overall design takes some cues from the International Style, an avant-garde architectural movement established in Europe in the early part of the 20th-century and which gained momentum in the United States after World War II. Here, there is no clear expression of the International Style or any other style. The architect of the Hunters View was Donald Beach Kirby. Kirby was a well-established architect in San Francisco that is still recognized for his contributions to public projects throughout the City, however, the Hunters View complex is not an outstanding example of his work.

2.) Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance. To be a resource for the purposes of CEQA, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the California Register criteria, but it also must have integrity. To retain historic integrity a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the aspects. The subject property has retained or lacks integrity from the period of significance noted above:

location,	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks	setting,	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks
association.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks	feeling,	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks
design,	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks	materials,	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks
workmanship	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks			

Notes: While Hunters View retains its location and association, because historic significance could not be established, a thorough evaluation of the site's integrity was not conducted.

3.) DETERMINATION Whether the property is an "historical resource" for purposes of CEQA

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Resource Present (Go to 6. below)	<input type="checkbox"/> Historical Resource Present (Continue to 4.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Category A (1/2)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Category B
		<input type="checkbox"/> Category C

4.) If the property appears to be an historical resource, whether the proposed project is consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards or if any proposed modifications would materially impair the resource (i.e. alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics which justify the property's inclusion in any registry to which it belongs).

- ☐ The project appears to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. (go to 6. below)
(Optional) ☐ See below explanation of how the project meets standards.
- ☐ The project is **NOT** consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and is a significant impact as proposed. (Continue to 5. if the project is an alteration)

5.) Character-defining features of the building to be retained or respected in order to avoid a significant adverse effect by the project, presently or cumulatively, as modifications to the project to reduce or avoid impacts. Please recommend conditions of approval that may be desirable to mitigate the project's adverse effects.


Notes:

6.) Whether the proposed project may have an adverse effect on off-site historical resources, such as adjacent historic properties.

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unable to determine

Notes: It is the determination of Staff that the proposed project will not have a negative impact on any potential off-site historic resources.

PRESERVATION COORDINATOR REVIEW

Signature 
Mark Luellen, Preservation Coordinator

Date: NOV. 6, 2007

cc: Sonya Banks, Recording Secretary, Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board
Vernaliza Byrd / Historic Resource Impact Review File



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

<https://archive.org/details/huntersviewhousi5200sanf>

